

**REMARKS**

**Status of the Application**

Claims 1-22, 24 and 25 are the claims that have been examined in the instant application.

Claims 1-9, 10-15 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zehavi (U.S. 2005/0083878) in view of Cannon et al. (U.S. 7,058,358).

Claims 1-9 contain otherwise allowable subject matter. Claims 11-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 16-22 and 25 are allowed.

By this Amendment, Applicant hereby amends claims 1, 3, 4, 10 and 14

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 16-22 and 25 are allowed, and that claims 1-9 are allowable upon correction of the §112, second paragraph deficiencies.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 11-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant hereby requests that any rewriting of claims 11-15 be held in abeyance until the Examiner has taken the opportunity to reconsider the rejections of the base claim.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

*Claims 1-9, 10-15 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.*

Applicant hereby amends claims 1, 3, 4, 10 and 14 in order to obviate the rejection.

**Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

*Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zehavi (U.S. 2005/0083878) in view of Cannon et al. (U.S. 7,058,358).*

Claim 10 recites, in part, “authentication information storage means for storing authentication information that is necessary for the data communication with the wireless LAN communication equipment via the wireless LAN” and “control means for automatically controlling the wireless communication means so as to send the authentication information stored in the authentication information storage means to the wireless LAN communication equipment.” The Examiner alleges that Zehavi discloses all of the elements of claim 10, but concedes that Zehavi fails to teach an authentication information storage means and a control means as recited in claim 10. However, the Examiner further alleges that Cannon cures the deficiency noted in Zehavi by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Cannon discloses enhanced wireless network security using GPS. A wireless piconet device according to Cannon establishes GPS coordinates, and a wireless piconet server determines if the GPS coordinates are within a set of predetermined boundaries of the secured area of the wireless piconet server. See col. 2, lines 43-59 of Cannon. If the device is within the

predetermined boundaries, access to the server is granted. However, contrary to the elements recited in claim 10, the GPS coordinates are not saved in an authentication information storage means.

Cannon also discloses that additional authentication information may be requested from an entering piconet device. However, this additional authentication information is not stored in an authentication information storage means. Rather, as noted in col. 5, lines 17-20 of Cannon, the additional authentication information is a password which is entered by a user. Thus, the additional authentication information is also not automatically sent, as recited in claim 10.

Thus, as Cannon fails to cure the defects noted in Zehavi with respect to claim 10, claim 10 is patentable over the applied art.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Dion R. Ferguson  
Registration No. 59,561

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 20, 2007